

May 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10195

So the amendment offered by Mr. ERVIN to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended (No. 124), offered by Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. DIRKSEN was rejected.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

PERSECUTION OF CERTAIN PERSONS BY SOVIET RUSSIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending business, under the unanimous consent agreement, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments. On page 2, line 5, after the word "humanity", to insert "be urged to"; in line 6, after the word "and", to strike out "fully" and insert "to"; and in the same line, after the word "permit", to insert "fully"; so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity be urged to cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses, and to permit fully the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I first rose in the U.S. Senate on September 23, 1963, to speak out about a great injustice: the Soviet persecution of the Jewish people. I asked the U.S. Senate to assume its solemn responsibility of voicing the national conscience in behalf of human rights.

I accused the Soviet Government of pursuing a systematic policy of attrition against its 3 million Jewish citizens.

I accused the Soviet Government of depriving Soviet Jews of their cultural rights.

I accused the Soviet Government of depriving Jewish citizens of their religious rights.

I accused the Soviet Government of pursuing a virulent anti-Jewish propaganda campaign.

I accused the Soviet Government of using Jews as scapegoats for their economic ills of the nation.

I accused the Soviet Government of discriminating against Jews in education and employment.

I accused the Soviet Government—having denied Jews their rights at home—of then cruelly refusing them the

right to emigrate and seek homes in freer lands.

All this, I said, adds up to a policy of reducing Jews to second-class citizenship in the Soviet Union—of breaking their spirit and crushing their pride. It aims to shatter, pulverize and gradually eliminate Jewish historical consciousness and Jewish identity.

It was at this time that I introduced S. 204 in the Senate protesting the persecution of Soviet Jewry. Armed with the facts about the situation, and sympathetic to the humane cause of a persecuted people, the Senate of the United States spoke out in September 1964, and voted 60 to 1 for my resolution condemning Soviet persecution of the Jews. But because the resolution had to go to conference as an amendment to the foreign aid bill—and because of the basic opposition of our State Department—it was not possible to keep the strong expression of the Senate intact. That is why I again introduced a concurrent resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 17—to express both the sentiment of the Senate and the other body. This resolution condemning the policy of the Soviet Government in persecuting the Jews now has 70 cosponsors in the Senate, and 114 in the House.

This policy works itself out as a whole. Let me give you a few examples of how it reaps its ill effects. The 3 million Jews of the U.S.S.R. are officially recognized as a nationality. Although they constitute only 1.09 percent of the total Soviet population, they rank 11th numerically among the more than 100 diverse Soviet nationalities.

Soviet ideology, Communist Party directives, the Soviet Constitution and law, and historic Soviet practice all recognize the inherent right of every Soviet nationality to maintain and perpetuate its own cultural identity, through its own cultural institutions in its own language.

But the Jews are the only nationality which is deprived of the basic cultural rights accorded to all the others.

Until 1940, they were permitted a large network of schools—elementary, middle and higher schools—in the Yiddish language.

Then in 1948, this whole vast array of institutions was forcibly closed down and liquidated. Hundreds of Jewish writers, artists and intellectuals were imprisoned or banished.

Jews are forbidden schools of their own. They are forbidden classes in Yiddish or Hebrew in the general schools. They are even forbidden classes in the Russian language on Jewish history and culture.

The Jews then have a status as a nationality, but they are also thought of as a religious group. Yet they have none of the prerogatives of the other major religious groups in the U.S.S.R.

Unlike all the other denominations, Jewish rabbis and congregations are not permitted to maintain nationwide federations or other central organizations for formal affiliation or contact with organizations of coreligionists abroad. Synagogues have been forcibly closed down in many cities. Although a small

number of prayer books was published in 1955, there is an extreme shortage, and so Hebrew Bible has been published since 1917. The only rabbinical seminary—opened in Moscow in 1957—was virtually closed down in 1962 when about a dozen students went to the Caucasus to vote in elections and to celebrate Passover with their families. Authorities forbade their return—supposedly because of a housing shortage.

The cultural and religious repression of Jews takes place within an atmosphere charged with a hateful press and propaganda campaign against Judaism. Jews are represented in traditional anti-Semitic ways—as unscrupulous, cunning, sly, or mean. Judaism as a religion is vilified.

And there are other ways of encouraging endemic anti-Semitism.

Alongside of the anti-Jewish propaganda, there has been a notable pattern of hostility against the Jews in the massive national campaign waged against economic offenses. Beginning in 1961, a series of decrees called for capital punishment for such crimes as embezzlement, currency speculation, and bribery. Of the 195 people sentenced to death for such crimes, at least 100—and possibly as many as 106—have been Jews. So the Soviet Government seems to consider the tiny community of Jews—just over 1 percent of the population—responsible for over half, and in some places 80 to 90 percent, of the economic crimes warranting capital punishment. And the publicity accompanying the trials consistently represents Jews as "slaves of gold," "money worshipers," and so forth.

What of other—less dramatic, but equally telling—forms of discrimination? The proportion of Jews in higher education—science and the professions in the Soviet Union has been declining for many years. There is a quota in many universities and advanced institutions. In 1935, 13.5 percent of all students in higher education were Jewish—today only 3.1 percent are Jewish. This despite the fact that the highly urbanized Jew aspires no less toward an education, for himself and his children.

A few Jews are still found in top positions in various walks of life. But Jews have disappeared from the diplomatic service—and with rare exceptions from responsible jobs in the armed forces. They are found in the middle ranks of economic, industrial, technical, and engineering work; even here they cannot hope to achieve leading positions.

Worst of all, thousands of Jews, denied their rights in the Soviet Union, wish desperately to leave.

Reunion with the remnants of their broken families—families which have created a new life on new soil, in the United States, in Israel, or elsewhere—this is their overwhelming hope. The Soviet Government denies them this hope. Recognizing in principle their right to leave, it will not honor this right in practice.

While the Congress is considering this resolution we vote upon today, across the land a great cry of protest is heard. Responsive to the action of the Senate,

groups have sprung up in many cities and towns. Rallies—meetings—in traditional American fashion, the American people have registered their repulsion at this new anti-Semitism.

Can such pressure and action have any impact on Soviet policy? Have they had any real effect in the last few years? Is there evidence of Soviet sensitivity to this world sentiment? Is there reason to believe that the specific condemnation I ask today can help to bring about a basic reversal of Soviet policy with regard to the Jews?

The skeptics ask these questions and they have the right to ask. They also have the right to be answered; and this I will do. First, though, let me say, that—regardless of the practical effect—there is a moral imperative involved here. We must speak out. History tells us that the silent onlooker becomes the moral accomplice to the crime.

Mr. President, already—in a mere matter of months—we have been heard by the Soviet authorities. We have concrete evidence of Soviet sensitivity to the voice of world conscience that has been expressed thus far. Look with me at some examples:

First. The Soviet English-language magazine distributed in the United States—*Soviet Life*—has during the past year run feature after feature denying the existence of Soviet anti-Semitism and of a Jewish problem in the Soviet Union. This monthly journal—modeled on *Life* magazine—has begun to portray Jewish life in rosy hues. According to *Soviet Life*'s articles, picture spreads, news items, and letters-to-the-editor answers, the Jew in Soviet Russia enjoys a life which is a cross between that in "I Love Lucy" and the "Real McCoys."

Second. Equally strenuous efforts have been made by Soviet propaganda organs in Europe. *Soviet Weekly* in England, for instance, has joined the campaign to paint Jewish existence in Soviet Russia in glowing tones.

Third. Radio Moscow and the Novosti Press Agency—the chief Soviet propaganda agencies—have been carrying material day after day which attempts to counter rising public opinion and protests wherever there is public opinion against persecution of Soviet Jewry—in Europe—in the United States and Latin America.

For instance, about a year ago, Novosti rounded up several groups of Soviet Jewish citizens and got them to sign letters protesting the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry of last April.

Again, Novosti has several so-called staff Jewish experts who are constantly writing articles on various facets of Soviet Jewish life, which are then sent to publications in the West. Most of these articles are placed in Communist—or fellow traveler type publications—though some reach non-Communist audiences.

Mr. President, it really does seem as though the Soviet Union doth protest too much. In October, 1963, a Conference on the Status of Soviet Jews met in New York under the auspices of such distinguished Americans as Justice William O. Douglas, Bishop James A. Pike,

Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Walter Reuther. About a hundred literary, religious, academic and governmental leaders attended.

A featured speaker was Dramatist Arthur Miller. As Mr. Miller himself told the group, the Soviet Embassy in Washington was so concerned about the impact of his appearance that it sent a high official to his home in an effort to dissuade him from attending and speaking.

Fourth. In my list of Soviet responses to public protest: Soviet Embassies in Washington, Ottawa, London, Mexico City, Canberra and elsewhere regularly issue lengthy denials of the charges brought against their country on the Jewish question.

In 1963, former Chairman Nikita Khrushchev found it necessary to reply personally to a letter of protest sent him by Bertrand Russell. Needless to say, the Chairman's reply was an unqualified denial. But that is not what is important. The significant fact is that Khrushchev himself actually replied, and that he deemed it advisable to publish the exchange in both *Pravda* and *Izvestia*.

Moreover, Lord Russell wrote to Aron Vergelis, editor of the Soviet Jewish literary periodical, *Sovietish Heimland*, about several aspects of the problem. Again, Vergelis found it necessary to reply and to publish the reply in his magazine.

Fifth. Last week, Alexander I. Zinchuk, counselor of the Russian Embassy here, went to the State Department to lodge a protest against "attempts to interfere in the domestic affairs of the U.S.S.R." by State Department support of my resolution in the Senate.

All of this indicates that the Soviet Union is extremely sensitive to this sort of criticism, just as it is sensitive to criticism about racial discrimination against African students. This hurts. So far, the efforts to allay this criticism have been largely confined to propaganda responses. Eventually, if we keep up the pressure, the Soviet Union will learn the only way to allay criticism of the civilized world is to discontinue the persecution which inspires it.

But, though the Soviet Union is indeed sensitive to world opinion, we have as yet seen no fundamental change in Soviet policy. There have been a number of small marginal changes—token changes, if you will. They do not reflect a major change in policy, but they are—again—concrete responses to the mobilization of liberal, humanitarian public opinion, and are therefore important. Some token changes which may be straws in the international winds:

First. Consider the Kichko case. In February 1964, we learned in New York that a viciously anti-Semitic book, "Judaism Without Embellishment," had been published in October 1963, in Kiev under the auspices of the Ukrainian Academy of Science. The author was T. F. Kichko, and he wrote his work in the Ukrainian language.

Very rapidly the Jewish Communist press—in New York, Israel, Paris, Canada and elsewhere—picked up the news and condemned the book mercilessly.

Soon official Communist papers around the world had to pick up the condemnation or face scorn in major cities everywhere.

The Soviet reaction was unprecedented. As a consequence of the worldwide storm provoked by the publication of the book, the Soviets took these steps:

Published a critique in a Ukrainian paper.

Convened a special session of the Ideological Commission of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and the Commission issued a sharp critique of the book which *Pravda* and *Izvestia* and other papers picked up. The book was withdrawn from circulation.

This sort of thing was previously unheard of in Soviet affairs. Certainly it was a dramatic reflection of Soviet sensitivity on this question in general—and especially to pressures from the Communist movement whose reaction was generated by the need to maintain relations with the non-Communist world.

Second. The baking of matzoh—which is necessary for the celebration of Passover—was allowed until 1957. Then there was a campaign to restrict matzoh, which began in outlying cities and finally reached a climax in Moscow during 1962. Last year there was no official baking of matzoh. As a result, for months now—as many of you have probably noticed—there has been an intensive press campaign in Western papers concerning the matzoh supply for Passover, 1965. It was partially effective. We have just learned that there was an adequate supply in two cities—Moscow and Leningrad—and the requirements of several other cities were partially filled. This is far from satisfactory, but it represents a marked improvement over the previous year's record.

Third. The general propaganda campaign against economic offenses, in which a negative stereotype of the Jew is projected, continues. However, far fewer death sentences have been recorded during this past year. This is a change, and one for which we can be grateful. The expression of public opinion on this question has been at least partially responsible.

Fourth. *Sovietish Heimland*, the lone Yiddish literary periodical published in Russia, began in 1961 as a bimonthly and was transformed into a monthly, beginning in January 1965. This magazine, though edited by an apologist for the Soviet policy of forced assimilation of Jewish culture, has nevertheless published literary materials of some intrinsic interest and value to Jews. More importantly, some of the ideological articles have indicated an acceptance of the fact that there is a Jewish people, and what is more, Jewish history, Yiddish and Hebrew literature. Recent issues of the magazine have contained progressively more news items of literary and cultural activities in Jewish circles outside the U.S.S.R.

Fifth. Fifteen thousand copies of a Yiddish book, entitled "This Is How We Live," were published recently. Primarily an anthology of articles that appeared earlier in *Sovietish Heimland*, the

May 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10197

book was mainly intended for export, as shown by its title and contents. Yet, it is a Yiddish book and therefore a welcome venture.

On April 28 of this year, it was reported from Moscow that a book of Yiddish poetry entitled "Horizonten" had been put on sale in the Kirov Street Bookshop. Five thousand copies were published at the equivalent of \$1 apiece. This book includes poems written by 50 authors. Publication was announced over 6 months ago in the Communist press in the West, and reporters tell us that the Jewish population of Moscow queued up for hours to get copies.

These lonely ventures do not even approach the rehabilitation of Jewish culture in the Soviet Union. As far as the publication of books is concerned, this would mean the establishment of a Jewish publishing house—the steady publication in Yiddish of both classic and contemporary Yiddish and Hebrew literary works—the publication of books on Jewish history and cultural heritage in Yiddish and Russian.

After all, in 1940, the last full year before the vicious Nazi attack on Russia, 359 Yiddish books appeared in the Soviet Union. Despite the deprivations caused by war, the immense toll in lives and property, Jewish book publication resumed after the war and slowly began to grow. By 1948, the last year before present persecution began, 60 Yiddish books were published.

All signs point to the fact that the Soviet authorities consider—and respond to world public opinion—as well as to the opinion of the world Communist movement and that of the Soviet intelligentsia itself.

We will know that the Soviets have caught up to the basic principles of enlightenment which began to illuminate the West as far back as the 18th century when they oppose oppression—not just because they are concerned about world opinion—but because they really believe in brotherhood and equality. That day may be far off. But until it comes, we have no alternative but to keep up the pressure—to bring the shocking facts and devastating indictments—so embarrassing to the Soviet Union—to the attention of men of conscience throughout the world.

Very well then, Mr. President, let us keep up the pressure. Let the conscience of our citizens be heard. Let the Congress of the United States—speaking as the duly elected Representatives of a free people—go on record once and for all with a strong protest against the persecution of the Soviet Jews. Let us do this because it is right and just, and oppression is wrong and vicious—for this is what we believe.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is ironic that during the very month that we are commemorating the 20th anniversary of the fall nazism and the 20th anniversary of the liberation of concentration camps we also find ourselves considering a resolution condemning anti-Jewish acts in the U.S.S.R.

Even the resolution before us is, in a way, an inadequate expression of our feelings, not because it is too strongly

worded or goes too far, as some critics have suggested—but rather that we Americans who are so concerned with what is transpiring in the Soviet Union today find that voicing our honest protest represents very close to the limit of what we can do effectively. We cannot send packages of needed foods or religious articles—the Soviets bar their delivery. We cannot provide a refuge either here or in Israel for the oppressed—the Soviets refuse exit permits. We cannot send teachers or rabbis to provide the warmth of extensive human contact—the Soviets bar the way. This resolution is the voice of protest of the people of the United States sounded through their elected Representatives and for it there is no effective alternative at this time which can serve the purpose we seek.

The facts of Soviet anti-Jewish actions are clear. They are denied religious rights guaranteed them by Soviet law, rights which are not denied other religious groups in the U.S.S.R. Jews are cut off from cultural rights—such as study of Yiddish—which are also guaranteed them by Soviet law, rights which other cultural groups enjoy without similar hindrance. These facts have been fully spread up the record, in House and Senate reports, by the United States in the United Nations, by State Department reports and by responsible private sources.

In spite of Soviet claims of religious and cultural freedom, there is ample and grim evidence that the U.S.S.R. is singling out Jews as a group for discriminatory restrictions and extreme punishment. Jews and the Jewish faith suffer greater limitations and prohibitions in the U.S.S.R. than any other religious group in the Soviet Union. Synagogue buildings and seminaries have been padlocked, Jewish cemeteries have been arbitrarily shut down and ritual supplies need for religious worship cannot be obtained. Hebrew bibles and prayer books are irreplaceable. The sale of kosher food, including matzo for the Passover, has been curbed. Means for training rabbis and community workers are inadequate or nonexistent and, unlike other religious groups Jews are not permitted to establish national organizations and are restricted in their contacts with their coreligionists outside the U.S.S.R. Jewish cultural life has been stifled and the once flourishing Yiddish literature in books, theater, periodicals, and newspapers is but a flickering shadow of its former vigorous self.

Last year two vicious anti-Semitic tracts published on Soviet Government presses were brought to light, "Jews Without Embellishment," by T. F. Chokko and "Contemporary Judaism and Zionism," by F. S. Mayatsky. These publications were reminiscent of the anti-Jewish trash published by Streicher and the Nazis during the heyday of the Hitler regime.

This year, another item has been brought to light, an article, "The Shadow of the Synagogue," published in Minsk in the leading Byelorussian-language daily newspaper in that capital city of the Byelorussian Republic. This article

applies the traditional anti-Semitic stereotypes to modern Soviet life. It utilizes the old clichés, accusing the Jews of participating along with American capitalists in an international conspiracy of money and power; it labels Judaism as anti-Soviet; maligns the Bible; and brands the synagogue as a center of immorality and evil. And, like so much other anti-Semitic propaganda, it reaches for the ludicrous—Rockefeller and Harriman are accused of being "at the head of the American Judaism organizations" along with Guggenheim and Morgenthau.

It is incredible that in this first decade of the space age, a major world power such as the Soviet Union should seemingly in this respect be so petty and impose cruel and repressive official harassment on a peaceful minority which represents but 1.1 percent of its population.

In a recent letter, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations Douglas MacArthur II indicated that the U.S.S.R. is "sensitive to world opinion." This sensitivity to public opinion has been evidenced in the past when from time to time the Soviets would relieve to a small degree the pressures on their Jewish citizens and make concessions following public outcry. This incontrovertible fact has moved all the major Jewish organizations in this country, along with non-Jewish bodies, to launch major public campaigns on behalf of Soviet Jewry, recruiting such world personalities as Bertrand Russell and the Queen of Belgium.

The Soviets are sensitive to world public opinion. This resolution will serve to further move that opinion and will, I am sure, have a salutary effect.

I wish to emphasize that the protest contemplated in this resolution is in the very finest of American traditions. In the past, our country has repeatedly protested the persecution of oppressed minorities by foreign governments, justified in these protests because they were in the cause of humanity. No policy is more firmly fixed in the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs than this moral imperative to come to the aid of oppressed peoples. The diplomatic and the historical record is complete and honorable and one that should make every American hold his head high.

Since 1840, the United States while recognizing the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of another state, nevertheless has protested the persecution of oppressed minorities by foreign governments. This policy has remained valid to this day. The United States has protested alone and it has protested in concert with other nations. Our country has never been silent in the face of persecution.

We have lodged protests and registered our disapproval in a variety of ways, among them, by direct communication to the governments concerned, by recalling the U.S. diplomatic representative for consultation, by the President through direct reference in his annual message to Congress, by the termination of a commercial treaty, and indirectly, by joining in multilateral acts of disapproval as a means of protest.

10198

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 14, 1965

The list of U.S. protests against the persecution of Jews is long and honorable. In 1840 the U.S. Consul in Constantinople joined with consuls from other powers to protest to the Ottoman Empire the conviction and execution of a Jew for blasphemy.

In 1870, Secretary of State Fish instructed the U.S. Minister to Turkey to urge the Turkish Government to stop the extensive murders of Jews in Rumania, then a Turkish possession.

In 1877, the United States granted protection to Russian Jews living in Jerusalem and Assistant Secretary of State F. W. Seward emphasized that the "sympathy of the United States for all oppressed peoples in foreign countries has been freely manifested in all cases where it could be done in accordance with the spirit of international courtesy and diplomatic usage."

In 1880 President Rutherford B. Hayes in his annual message to Congress reported that our consul in Tangier had been instructed to express to the Emperor of Morocco the concern of the United States over the persecutions of Jews in Morocco and to urge him to end such actions.

In 1880, 1881, and 1882, the United States protested to czarist Russia the persecution of Jews in response to appeals by American Jewish organizations. In 1892 the platforms of the Democratic and Republican Parties both contained planks protesting the continued outbreaks against Jews in Russia.

These and other protests were supported by the American people and by resolutions of the Congress. They culminated in 1911 in the action by President William Howard Taft terminating the treaty of commerce with Russia which had been in effect since 1832. American public opinion was so outraged by Russian pogroms that President Taft took his action over the advice of the Department of State, which had warned of the serious commercial consequences of such abrogation as well as the larger political considerations.

Although Russia has been historically a major target of American protests, the United States has on other occasions denounced persecution of Jews by Rumania, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Italy, and Poland. In the 1930's U.S. protests to the Nazi government were frequent and vigorous. Secretary of State Cordell Hull wrote in his "Memoirs" that "I found myself calling in the German Ambassador time after time to protest against violations of the rights of our citizens, against persecution of the Jews, and against mistreatment of Americans by Nazi bullies."

Secretary Hull's "Memoirs" were published in 1948 and in the second volume he made the following general comment:

Palestine was but one facet of the unremitting effort of the State Department for over a decade to assist the Jews caught by the unspeakable Nazi persecution. In the 1930's we had made innumerable representations to the Germans and taken concrete steps to evince our condemnation of this persecution and to induce the Nazis to desist. We had likewise brought every possible influence to bear on countries adjacent to Germany to receive, feed, and clothe the Jews of Germany, and on other countries to afford them refuge.

And, more recently, the 1964 platforms of both the Republican and Democratic parties contained clear denouncements of Soviet anti-Semitism. The Democratic platform stated: "We deplore Communist oppression of Jews and other minorities." The Republicans stated: "We condemn the persecution of minorities, such as the Jews, within Communist borders." The pending resolution offers the opportunity to give voice to these platform declarations of our two great parties.

This resolution, too, will demonstrate that the United States and its people hold firm to the humanitarian tradition that has long been a jewel of our history.

And, finally, the resolution will tell those who still suffer under the hand of the oppressor that we, a decade after the events of May 1945, have not forgotten.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the concurrent resolution, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN],

the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIN], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 72 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morton
Allott	Hill	Moss
Anderson	Holland	Mundt
Bass	Inouye	Murphy
Bayh	Jackson	Muskie
Bible	Javits	Pearson
Boggs	Jordan, N.C.	Prouty
Brewster	Jordan, Idaho	Proxmire
Burdick	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Case	Lausche	Robertson
Church	Long, Mo.	Russell, S.C.
Clark	Long, La.	Scott
Cooper	Magnuson	Simpson
Dodd	Mansfield	Smith
Dominick	McCarthy	Sparkman
Douglas	McClellan	Stennis
Ellender	McGee	Talmadge
Ervin	McGovern	Thurmond
Fong	McIntyre	Tydings
Harris	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Hartke	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Hayden	Monroney	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—32

Bartlett	Fulbright	Pastore
Bennett	Gore	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Gruening	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Russell, Ga.
Cannon	Kennedy, Mass.	SaltonSTALL
Carlson	Kennedy, N.Y.	Smathers
Cotton	Miller	Symington
Curtis	Montoya	Tower
Dirksen	Morse	Yarborough
Eastland	Nelson	Young, Ohio
Fannin	Neuberger	

So the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States deeply believes in freedom of religion for all people and is opposed to infringement of this freedom anywhere in the world; and

Whereas abundant evidence has made clear that the Government of the Soviet Union is persecuting, in varying degrees of intensity, elements of its Christian, Jewish, and Muslim citizens; and

Whereas there is also abundant evidence that Jewish citizens have been singled out for extreme punishment for alleged economic offenses, by confiscating synagogues, by closing Jewish cemeteries, by arresting rabbis and lay religious leaders, by curtailing religious observances, by discriminating against Jews in cultural activities and access to higher education, by imposing restrictions that prevent the reuniting of Jews with their families in other lands, and by other acts that oppress Jews in the free exercise of their faith; and

May 17, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10199

Whereas the Soviet Union has a clear opportunity to match the words of its constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion with specific actions so that the world may know whether there is a genuine hope for a new day of better understanding among all people: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all Senators may be allowed to insert statements relative to the concurrent resolution which has just been agreed to. I also overlooked the fact that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROVY] asked to be put on the list as a cosponsor of the resolution and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Foreign Relations Committee, on which I serve, has unanimously reported the resolution condemning the terrible persecution of the Jewish religion by the Soviet Government.

All religions and all minorities are persecuted in the Soviet Union and this persecution merits the condemnation of honorable men everywhere.

The amended resolution reflects this by including Christian and Muslim citizens as well as Jews.

But I continue to firmly believe there are a number of reasons which justify a separate resolution condemning the persecution of the Jews by the Soviet Government.

First of all, there is the evidence that the Soviet regime, like the Czarist regime before it, exploits the Jew as a scapegoat—as a convenient object for popular resentment which might otherwise be directed against the regime. Secondly, the persecution of the Jews and of the Jewish religion in the Soviet Union has been even more severe than that suffered by other religious groups.

Physically, the persecution of the Jews has been on a par with that of the Ukrainians. Culturally, their persecution is total. While all religion is persecuted and regulated, the Jewish religion is persecuted with particular ruthlessness. There are some major Soviet cities where not a single synagogue today survives. The single Jewish theological seminary permitted to exist is limited to enrollment of some dozen students. The graduates cannot begin to replace the rabbis who are now dying off from old age in increasing numbers. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to state that the Soviet authorities have been moving in a direction which could mean the total obliteration of the Jewish religion within the coming decade.

So even though persecution affects many different peoples, I think Soviet policy is unusually harsh toward the Jews.

It is for this reason that I was honored to join with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], in cosponsoring this resolution when he introduced it in February.

Although the resolution has been broadened somewhat by the committee, I think it is still primarily directed toward persecution of the Jewish religion.

I am most gratified by the unanimous Senate vote just taken.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 152 AND 159

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. TALMADGE. I call up my amendments 152 and 159 which are now at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, lines 18 to 25, both inclusive, and page 8, lines 1 to 19, both inclusive, strike out section 5 in its entirety. Renumber sections 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 as sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, respectively.

On page 3, lines 7 to 25, both inclusive, and page 4, lines 1 to 6, both inclusive, strike out subsection (c) of section 3 in its entirety.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

SENATOR PROXMIRE'S RESPONSE TO SENATOR MUNDT ON BUNDY PARTICIPATION IN VIETNAM DISCUSSION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have notified the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] that I would reply at this time to a statement he made earlier today, in which he criticized the President for permitting one of his top foreign policy advisers, Mr. McGeorge Bundy, to engage in a highly controversial all day discussion of the Vietnam situation in Washington tomorrow.

Mr. President, tomorrow's Vietnam discussion has been called a top level teach-in, a knock-down, drag-out donnybrook and other things. The participation of Mr. Bundy in the discussion has been criticized, as the Senator from South Dakota pointed out, by a great newspaper, the Washington Evening Star.

I rise to defend Mr. Bundy's participation, and I do so enthusiastically.

Frankly, I cannot think of any contribution the President might make tomorrow to a better, deeper understanding of the rightness of our cause in South Vietnam than to send Mr. Bundy in to do verbal battle with some of the Nation's top domestic critics of our Vietnam program.

The Senator from South Dakota asked if the President of the United States

should encourage controversy about our role in South Vietnam. I say emphatically yes.

I ask: Is there any subject facing the Nation today more important than its involvement in Vietnam? Is there any subject on which public enlightenment—including enlightenment by the intellectual leaders of our country—is more important?

Since when has this Nation been so feeble that discussion as critical and probing as possible of our biggest international problems by competent, responsible officials can do us significant harm?

If the Presidential position on South Vietnam—which I enthusiastically support—is so weak that it cannot stand vigorous challenge, then the President should change it.

In my judgment, Mr. Bundy will acquit his administration and the policies of his President nobly. The logic of his position is so strong, the alternatives to the course the President is pursuing in South Vietnam are so impossible, that I am convinced the highly distinguished academicians who will attend the discussion cannot fail to be impressed, and on some points—to some degree—persuaded.

At the same time, what in the world is wrong with listening respectfully to our critics on this matter? On some points they could be right. If they are right, our policies can only be strengthened by recognizing valid criticism and adjusting our policies accordingly.

Mr. President, it is a platitude to say that this kind of discussion could never take place in Russia, China, or North Vietnam. Critical, open discussion is not only our glory, Mr. President, it is also our strength.

In one of the greatest essays ever written on political science, Walter Begehot in his remarkable book, "Physics and Politics," examines the strengths and weaknesses of democracies. He concludes that discussion, debate, and difference is the real source of democratic strength.

Why? Because that kind of dissent is exactly what enables a democracy to refine and improve, to change and adjust its policies.

I am convinced that what this country needs, and needs badly, is not less dissent and discussion over Vietnam but more, much more. I say this as a supporter of the President—not a "yes—but" supporter, but a supporter—period. It is exactly because I believe so deeply in these policies that I am convinced discussion will strengthen the hand of the President, not weaken it.

In the past 2 or 3 weeks, the State Department has wisely sent a team of experts to college campuses to explain the administration's Vietnam policies. At the University of Wisconsin campus in my own State, they were greeted with catcalls and boos, in a display that did more to discredit the forces that had been critical of the administration's Vietnam policies in Wisconsin than any argument had been able to do.

But in Milwaukee and elsewhere, the State Department experts were heard. Their arguments were listened to. They were questioned probingly. Everything

I have heard from Wisconsin since their visit has been favorable to a deeper, broader, and more sympathetic understanding of the President's policies. These discussions have been a success for one paramount reason: because our cause in South Vietnam, tragic as is its necessity, is a right cause, that is reserved as right when the facts are fully and competently explained.

Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota said that Mr. Bundy should not speak because he represents the White House, that he is privy to classified information and would therefore be under restraint in replying to critics, or might be goaded into saying something that would be damaging to the national interest.

All of this boils down to whether we have faith in Mr. Bundy. I do have. He is thoroughly competent. He is as well informed on the administration's position as any man in government today. He is an able, in fact a brilliant man. What is wrong with sending the most competent available man, this former dean of Harvard college into this academic battle to plead a cause we believe is right?

Senator MUNDT also referred to President Johnson's wise and proper refusal to debate Senator Goldwater in last year's Presidential campaign.

What kind of a comparison is this? Mr. Bundy is an able adviser. He is not President of the United States. He talks with the President. He advises the President; but what he says cannot be considered by anyone to have the force of real executive authority or power.

He is an adviser, a staff man. His advice is accepted sometimes, rejected sometimes. Not one American, not one foreigner will consider that he speaks with the force or significance of the President.

One final word, there have been some supporters of the administration on Vietnam who have criticized Senators and others who have spoken out against the administration's policies in Vietnam. Frankly, I couldn't disagree more with this support or shut-up view.

While I vehemently disagree with much of what the Senator from Oregon has said on this subject and wholly oppose his denunciation of our position in Vietnam, I think he has served his country and this Senate well—not just well but brilliantly—by his constant, long time criticism of our position in Vietnam. Any enemy of this country who may feel comfort in such criticism must have been long ago aware that the Senator from Oregon is not President, and that his able speeches do no represent the view of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, Prof. Lindsay Rogers of Columbia University said some years ago that the U.S. Senate is probably the last forum in this Nation where the great national issues can be hammered out in debate before a nationally attentive audience.

The right of a U.S. Senator to stand on his feet as long as he is physically able to speak his mind before an onlooking nation means very little if the muzzle is on when the big controversial issues like Vietnam come along.

Historically, in times of international crisis, Senate criticism has always caused American Presidents pain and concern. Before World War I, that group of great Senators led by the man who occupied the Senate seat I now hold, old Bob La Follette, were characterized by President Wilson as a little band of willful men.

Senate criticism of Franklin Roosevelt's international policies before World War II was similarly resented. These were times of the greatest peril for this country, certainly far greater than what we face, at least until now, in Vietnam. And yet I do not know of a single competent historian who contends that, in World War I, La Follette or Norris, or in World War II, Wheeler or Nye, significantly damaged America's cause by criticizing the war policies of the President.

The value of criticism in this democracy has been its true strength. Its price has been small.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I compliment the Senator on his very fine statement. The logic of his position is irrefutable. He is correct in saying that Mr. Bundy should appear at the meeting. What is wrong with having someone appear at the meeting who is well informed and can set forth the position of the administration? I believe the Senator's case is incontrovertible.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. I feel, too, that this is a logical decision. I would not have risen if there had not been criticism of the President from another Senator for sending Mr. Bundy to the conference tomorrow.

I say hail to the senior Senator from Oregon, hail to the academic promoters who conceived and executed this massive teach-in, obviously for the purpose of a critical examination of the most important problem this Nation faces.

Debate on the Senate floor and in the Washington forum in which Mr. Bundy will be engaged tomorrow will increase public understanding of this cruel, costly, risky duty on which we are involved. And although I support their policies I think this dissent may also improve and refine them.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, inasmuch as both of my amendments strike at the provisions in the bill which would limit or prohibit the right of sovereign State legislatures to pass laws without the approval of the Attorney General and the District Court for the District of Columbia, I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON ON MONDAY—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT LIMITING DEBATE ON PENDING AMENDMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from

Georgia would consider the possibility of a time limitation on the pending amendments?

Mr. TALMADGE. Yes, indeed. I have talked with Senators who are interested in the amendments. They have stated to me that some of them, at least, desire to speak on the amendments. I am prepared to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the amendments at 2 o'clock on Monday afternoon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is very reasonable. I thank the Senator. Would it be the Senator's suggestion that the time limitation be not applied this afternoon, but that the time limitation be applied on Monday after the transaction of morning business?

Mr. TALMADGE. I think that is agreeable. That would follow to some extent the pattern of what was done today. In other words, 30 minutes would be allowed for the transaction of routine morning business, and then there would be about an hour and a half for debate on the amendments, to be equally divided between the floor manager of the bill, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and myself, or someone acting in my behalf.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business of the Senate today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that when the Senate convenes on Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon, time be allowed for the transaction of routine morning business not to exceed in time 12:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That the time from 12:30 to 2 o'clock be divided equally between the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that a vote be had at any time, up to 2 o'clock, that the debate is concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendments.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That the Senate proceed to vote not later than 2 o'clock p.m., on Monday, May 17, 1965, on amendments numbered 152 and 159, en bloc, called up by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] to the substitute amendment by Senators MANSFIELD and DIRKSEN, No. 124, as amended, for the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Provided, That all time for debate after the transaction of routine morning business on Monday, May 17, 1965, not to exceed 12:30 o'clock p.m., shall be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, amendment No. 152 would strike section 3(c) from the amendment in the nature